

Forest. Several of Missouri's proud historical landmarks, which are important elements of this site, will be maintained and preserved for current and future generations through the efforts of the city of Rolla—at a substantially reduced cost to State and Federal taxpayers.

This is particularly important to bear in mind, since this facility would have no further commercial viability without the direct involvement of the city of Rolla. So now, two worthy goals can be achieved—economic development and historical preservation. Indeed, there are other facilities that would serve the city's need for a tourist center, but the local community and its leaders have had the vision to realize this is a prime opportunity to help themselves and relieve Federal taxpayers from the burden of maintaining these Forest Service buildings and related facilities within the city of Rolla.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the leadership efforts of the Mark Twain National Forest and the city of Rolla. I urge the expeditious approval of this measure in order that the citizens of Rolla can get on with the business of economic development and job creation.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 701, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey lands to the city of Rolla, MO. H.R. 701 is nearly identical to H.R. 3426 that was introduced in the 103d Congress by Congressman EMERSON. H.R. 3426 was passed by unanimous consent in the House after being discharged by the Agriculture Committee at the very end of the session. The Senate took no action on the bill before adjournment.

H.R. 701 authorizes the city of Rolla to pay fair market value for the lands described by the bill. The city may pay for the land in full within 6 months of conveyance or, at the option of the city, pay for land in annual payments over 20 years with no interest. If the 20-year option is taken, the payments must be put in a Sisk Act Fund where they will be available, subject to appropriation, until expended by the Secretary. The bill also releases the U.S. Forest Service from liability due to hazardous wastes found on the property that were not identified prior to conveyance and requires the preservation of historic resource on the property.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 701

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. LAND CONVEYANCE, ROLLA RANGER DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE SITE, ROLLA, MISSOURI.**

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the terms and conditions specified in this section, the Secretary of Agriculture may sell to the city of Rolla, Missouri (in this section referred to as the "City"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following:

The property identified as the Rolla Ranger District Administrative site of the Forest Service located in Rolla, Phelps County, Missouri, encompassing ten acres more or less, the conveyance of which by C.D. and Oma A. Hazlewood to the United States was recorded on May 6, 1936, in book 104, page 286 of the Record of Deeds of Phelps County, Missouri.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration of the conveyance under subsection (a), the City shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the property as determined by an appraisal acceptable to the Secretary and prepared in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition as published by the Department of Justice. Payment shall be due in full within six months after the date the conveyance is made or, at the option of the City, in twenty equal annual installments commencing on January 1 of the first year following the conveyance and annually thereafter until the total amount due has been paid.

(c) DEPOSIT OF FUNDS RECEIVED.—Funds received by the Secretary under subsection (b) as consideration for the conveyance shall be deposited into the special fund in the Treasury authorized by the Act of December 4, 1967 (16 U.S.C. 484a, commonly known as the Sisk Act). Such funds shall be available, subject to appropriation, until expended by the Secretary.

(d) RELEASE.—Subject to compliance with all Federal environmental laws prior to transfer, the City, upon conveyance of the property under subsection (a), shall agree in writing to hold the United States harmless from any and all claims relating to the property, including all claims resulting from hazardous materials on the conveyed lands.

(e) RIGHT OF REENTRY.—The conveyance to the City under subsection (a) shall be made by quitclaim deed in fee simple, subject to a right of reentry in the United States if the Secretary determines that the City is not in compliance with the compensation requirements specified in subsection (b) or other condition prescribed by the Secretary in the deed of conveyance.

(f) CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES.—In consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office of the State of Missouri, the Secretary shall ensure that the historic resources on the property to be conveyed are conserved by requiring, at the closing on the conveyance of the property, that the City convey an historic preservation easement to the State of Missouri assuring the right of the State to enter the property for historic preservation purposes. The historic preservation easement shall be negotiated between the State of Missouri and the City, and the conveyance of the easement shall be a condition to the conveyance authorized under subsection (a). The protection of the historic resources on the conveyed property shall be the responsibility of the State of Missouri and the City, and not that of the Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 701, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

**MODIFYING BOUNDARIES OF TALLADEGA NATIONAL FOREST**

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill, H.R. 1874, to modify the boundaries of the Talladega National Forest, Alabama, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. STENHOLM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object, but I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding under his reservation of objection.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would transfer land currently under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management to the Forest Service. The land is currently being managed by the Forest Service. Another reason for the transfer is that the Penhody National Recreational Trail runs through a portion of the land that we are transferring. This transfer will enhance the management of the Penhody. The total amount being transferred is 559 acres. It is my understanding that the minority has no objection to this legislation, and that the administration is in support.

Mr. Speaker, I will include a document titled "Questions and Answers, H.R. 1874, Talladega National Forest," for the RECORD.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1874, a bill to modify the boundaries of the Talladega National Forest. This bill is a commonsense attempt to streamline and make more cost-efficient the management of our national forests by transferring two small tracts of adjacent Bureau of Land Management [BLM] land to the Talladega National Forest in Alabama. I commend our colleague, Mr. BROWDER of Alabama, in his efforts.

H.R. 1874 modifies the boundaries of the Talladega National Forest in Alabama by transferring approximately 350 acres of Bureau of Land Management [BLM] land to the Talladega National Forest. Both the U.S. Forest Service and the BLM support the concept of the transfer. The bill ensures that no existing rights of way, easement, lease license or permit shall be affected by the transfer.

According to the U.S. Forest Service this transfer will actually reduce the amount of boundary line the U.S. Forest Service will be required to maintain. Further, because the BLM lands are adjacent to or surrounded by the Talladega National Forest, the Congressional Budget Office reports that there are no significant costs to the government associated with the change in jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like included in the RECORD a document from the U.S. Forest Service entitled "Questions and Answers, H.R. 1874, Talladega National Forest, Alabama," regarding the transfer.

QUESTION AND ANSWERS, H.R. 1874, TALLADEGA NATIONAL FOREST, ALABAMA

Q. Where is the Talladega National Forest located in Alabama?

A. The Talladega National Forest is broken up into two divisions—the Oakmulgee Division, located in central Alabama South and West of Birmingham, Alabama; and the Talladega Division, located east central Alabama and being East of Birmingham, Alabama.

Q. Which Division is effected by H.R. 1874?  
A. The land is located on the Talladega Division.

Q. Where on the Talladega Division are the tracts mentioned in H.R. 1874 located?

A. The first tract is located in Cleburne County and contains 399.4 acres and is more particularly described as Township 17 South, Range 8 East, Section 34, NE¼, SW¼, and S½ NW¼. This tract is located within the existing Proclamation Boundary of the Talladega N.F. and close to being surrounded by National Forest ownership.

The second tract is located in Calhoun County and contains 160 acres and is more particularly described as Township 13 South, Range 9 East, Section 28, SE¼. This tract is located just outside of the existing Proclamation Boundary of Talladega N.F. but is adjacent to and contiguous with National Forest ownership.

Q. What's presently located on these lands?  
A. Both properties are forested tracts with pine and hardwood. There are no known or surveyed cultural resource sites or threatened or endangered species known to be located on these tracts. However, the first and largest tract is located inside a tentative Habitat Management Area for the Red Cockaded Woodpecker, a listed endangered species. In addition, the Pinhoti Trail, administered by the Forest Service, runs through the largest tract.

Q. What is a Habitat Management Area (HMA)? and why is it "tentative"?

A. This is an area that contains pine and pine-hardwood forest types that will be managed for the recovery of the Red Cockaded Woodpecker.

It is "tentative" until the Forest has completed its Forest Plan Revision.

Q. Just what is the Pinhoti Trail?

A. The Pinhoti Trail is a National Recreation Trail that was so designated back in 1977. It is a foot trail that extends for 98.6 miles along the mountains, valleys, and ridges of the Talladega Division, Talladega National Forest.

Q. Where does the Pinhoti Trail begin and end?

A. The trail starts on the Talladega Ranger District at Clairmont Gap off of the Talladega Scenic Drive and ends on the Northeastern boundary of the Shoal Creek Ranger District at Highway 278.

Q. H.R. 1874 indicates that the first tract contains 399.4 acres while the description calls for 399.4 acres. Which is correct?

A. The 399.4 acres is correct. There was probably a typo error made while drafting the bill. However, the description is accurate.

Q. Just what does the Bill do?

A. The Bill will transfer jurisdiction of these two tracts totaling 559.4 acres from the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of Interior to the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Q. Why is this necessary?

A. As pointed out, the effected lands are adjacent to and mixed in with existing National Forest lands. This would ease the administration of these federal lands for both agencies.

Q. Does BLM Agree with this change of jurisdiction?

A. Yes. They have worked closely with the Forest Service on this transfer for a number of years.

Q. Does the public have any concern about the change?

A. No. They already think the land is part of the National Forest System because of their location. This is especially true where the Pinhoti Trail runs through the larger tract in Cleburne County. In fact, the Forests current Administrative Map shows the 399 acre parcel as being national forest.

The county records in Cleburne County shows the property to be owned by the "USA Talladega NF"; while the Calhoun County records shows it to be owned by the "US Forestry Division".

Q. Why does the Administrative Map show this property to be National Forest?

A. Probably an error was made when the map was last revised since the property is government land, almost surrounded by national forest land and has the Pinhoti Trail running through it.

Q. Are there any right-of-ways, easements, leases, licenses or permits on the lands being transferred?

A. There are no known right-of-ways, easements, etc. or known claims (neither properties are adjacent to residential development) on either of the properties. If there were, the Forest Service has the necessary authority and regulations to handle.

Q. What is the history of these Tracts?

A. The 160 acre parcel, located in Calhoun County, has never been patented and was not withdrawn from the Public Domain when the Talladega National Forest was established by Proclamation 2190 dated 7/17/1936. This property has always been owned by the United States.

The 399 acre parcel, located in Cleburne County, was patented to the State of Alabama back in August 1941. A clause in the Patent stated "this patent is issued upon the express condition that the land hereby granted shall revert to the USA upon a finding by the Secretary of Interior that for a period of five (5) consecutive years such land has not been used by the said State of Alabama for park or recreational purposes, or that such land or any part thereof is being devoted to other uses." On November 14, 1978, the State of Alabama Quitclaimed this land to the United States and on February 9, 1979 title was accepted by the Bureau of Land Management.

(NOTE: The 1891 Organic Act originally gave the President the authority to place forest land into public reservations by Proclamation. President Franklin Roosevelt issued a Proclamation withdrawing the land now within our forest boundary for public recreational use pursuant to the Recreation and Public Purposes Act before the Talladega National Forest was established by Presidential Proclamation in 1936. A patent on the withdrawn lands was then issued to the State in 1941 with a reversionary clause to the United States. Alabama reconveyed by Quit Claim deed to the United States in 1978 due to its non-use. The Proclamation creating the Talladega National Forest included a provision that all lands hereafter acquired by the United States under the Weeks Act should be administered as a part of the Talladega National Forest. This provision, however, only applied to lands acquired under the Weeks Act, and not the BLM land which simply reverted back to the United States. The proclamation itself no longer had the force of law when the United States regained title to the subject land due to the repeal of the 1891 Act by section 704 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. Hence, the subject land reverted to the status of unappropriated public land, and hence are not included within the Talladega National Forest as they had been withdrawn in favor of the State of Alabama prior to the proclamation and were later patented to the State, thus entirely escaping federal control and the scope of the proclamation.)

Q. What boundaries are being modified?

A. As previously indicated, the 160 acre parcel located in Calhoun County is located adjacent to but west of and outside of the existing Proclamation Boundary for the Talladega National Forest. The Bill would extend this boundary to incorporate the tract.

The 399.4 acre parcel located in Cleburne County is within the Proclamation Boundary. Technically no boundary modification is needed in this case as far as the Proclamation Boundary is concerned. However, the land line boundary would technically be changed in the jurisdictional transfer.

Regardless of the technicality of boundary modification, the Bill does effect the correct transfer of jurisdiction being sought by both agencies.

Q. How many additional acres of lands does the BLM presently have jurisdiction over that are within or adjacent to the Talladega National Forest?

A. None to the best of our knowledge.

Q. How is BLM presently managing these lands to be transferred to the Forest Service?

A. They are currently being managed for hunting and dispersed recreation.

Q. How much will it cost the Forest Service to administer these lands?

A. The main additional cost would be to maintain the approximately 1 mile of additional boundary lines located on the 160 acre parcel in Calhoun County. Estimated cost for maintenance runs around \$500 to \$600 per mile. However, with the tract located in Cleburne County, the Forest Service would actually lose approximately 1¼ miles of land lines. Therefore there is a net loss of around ¾ miles of land lines that the Forest Service will not have to maintain.

Since the lands are adjacent to and/or are within the existing National Forest, there will be little or no additional costs associated with the change of jurisdiction. The 599 acres would be incorporated into the 229,772 acres that currently makes up the Talladega Division, Talladega National Forest. (Total for the entire Talladega National Forest is 387,176 acres.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1874

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF TALLADEGA NATIONAL FOREST.

(a) BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—The exterior boundaries of the Talladega National Forest is hereby modified to include the following described lands:

Huntsville Meridian, Township 17 South, Range 8 East, Section 34, NE¼, SW¼, and S½NW¼, Cleburne County, containing 399.40 acres, more or less.

Huntsville Meridian, Township 13 South, Range 9 East, Section 28, SE¼, Calhoun County, containing 160.00 acres, more or less.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—(1) Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal lands described under subsection (a) are hereby added to and shall be administered as part of the Talladega National Forest, and the Secretary of the Interior shall transfer, without reimbursement, administrative jurisdiction over such lands to the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the validity of or the terms

and conditions of any existing right-of-way, easement, lease, license, or permit on lands transferred by subsection (a), except that such lands shall be administered by the Forest Service. Reissuance of any authorization shall be in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applying to the Forest Service, and the change of jurisdiction over such lands resulting from the enactment of this Act shall not constitute a ground for the denial of renewal or reissuance of such authorization.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1874, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

□ 1220

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### RESTRICTIONS ON POLITICAL ADVOCACY MISGUIDED AND MISPLACED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will take up consideration of the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. I want to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that not included in this appropriations bill are some 13 pages of legislation, something we are not supposed to do on appropriations bills.

The topic of this 13-page legislative provision is "Political Advocacy." It flies directly in the face of the first amendment to the Constitution which says that this body, the Congress, shall make no law concerning free speech, freedom of association, or the right to petition the Government. But that is precisely what this 13-page piece of legislation, buried in this appropriations bill, will do.

Mr. Speaker, the subtitle of this title says, "Prohibition on the Use of Federal Funds for Political Advocacy." As it happens, of course, that is already illegal. The real sweep of this legislative proposal has very little to do with Federal funds. What it does have to do with is your use of your own funds. Every single American citizen, non-profit organization, recipient of a Fed-

eral research grant likely is going to be swept into the impact of this incredible and chilling piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the definition of "political advocacy," which is one of the principal operative concepts in this bill, it includes virtually everything that you might have thought was protected speech under the first amendment to the Constitution. Even an inkind contribution to a political campaign; even the purchase of something that has nothing to do with politics, if the person or the organization you are purchasing it from happens to have used more than 15 percent of its resources on political advocacy. Again, political advocacy includes just about anything having to do with trying to affect the political debate in this country not just at the Federal level, but at the State and local levels as well.

Mr. Speaker, the other principal concept that makes this such an overarching and intrusive provision has to do with the definition of grant, because it is only grantees, recipients of grants, that are swept into this new regime of accounting for political speech. But again, if you look at the definition of grant, it is not just what you might think in a commonsensical way; that is, the provision of funds to somebody directly from the Federal Government. No, it is much broader than that. It includes anything of value provided, not given, but provided, to any person or organization.

So if you consider, as absurd as it may seem, that this political advocacy restriction applies to anyone who gets a grant, it will impact, for instance, the following kinds of people: Disaster victims getting emergency housing assistance grants; nurses who may have received a national research service award; low-income tenants receiving section 8 housing grants; researchers receiving money from the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation; and, Indian tribes. Now, State and local governments are excluded, but not Indian tribes, for instance, getting grants for economic development activities.

So it is incredibly far reaching and intrusive, and it not only affects what you can do with public money, but it affects what you can do with your own money. If you fall into this trap, and almost all of us will, you could not spend more than 5 percent of your own money on any of these political advocacy activities. State, Federal, local, anything at all, or you would be disqualified from getting any kind of Federal grant, again broadly defined, over a period of 5 years.

Mr. MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for taking his time in pointing out what is an incredible amendment to the bill that we will be asked to vote on.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. As

the gentleman just described it, as I understand it, if you are a big farmer in the central valley of California and you are receiving a water subsidy, or you are a timber company and you are receiving hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies in road building or water subsidies, or if you are a mining company and you have received land under a grant from the Federal Government, or if you are an oil company and you are receiving royalty subsidies or tax subsidies, you can come here and lobby all you want to increase those subsidies, to reduce them or to change the law. But if you are a public interest group and you have received any Federal money, you then have a limitation on money that you have privately raised or the private sector has participated with you; is that correct?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, actually, this goes even farther and includes some of the groups that the gentleman from California mentioned.

Now, it would not affect defense contractors, for instance, but the way I read it, somebody getting Burec water at a subsidized rate would indeed be swept under the provisions of this proposal.

#### PROTECTING AMERICAN WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will be considering the Labor and Health and Human Services appropriations bill, and this bill will have provisions in it that really punish working Americans and working families in this country.

We now believe that when we send a member of our family out into the workplace in this country, that they have a reasonable expectation, and we have a reasonable expectation, that our children or our spouse will go to work in a relatively safe workplace, and that that workplace will meet certain standards as to its obligations to members of our family as they go to work.

Mr. Speaker, that is because of OSHA and the laws of general duty and obligations that says, an employer has an obligation to provide a safe workplace, but also because of the many standards that OSHA has developed to make the construction trades safer; that make the mining industry, in the case of MSHA, safer; that make the chemical industry safer, and it has made the petroleum industry safer, throughout the American economy. We have done this all at the same time that productivity has increased dramatically in this country.

So it is not to suggest that OSHA, as others have, that somehow they have to be curtailed because they curtail productivity, because there is just no evidence that that is in fact the case.